



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,441	02/19/2002	Yoshiyuki Batori	1232-4823	9185

27123 7590 02/15/2006  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER  
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101

EXAMINER

MASINICK, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2125

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/079,441	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BATORI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Michael D. Masinick	<b>Art Unit</b> 2125	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-28 and 43-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-28, 43-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 14-28 and 43-45 are pending in this application. This is a non-final action in response to an RCE filed January 19, 2006.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/19/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner appreciates the drawing submitted with the arguments as it does help to envision the intent of the applicant. This drawing should be submitted as an additional official drawing in the case as it is depicting what is being claimed.
2. Examiner continues to believe that the claims are not easy to understand even with the aid of the submitted picture. This presents a claim interpretation problem where various people reading the claims would interpret them in a variety of ways. Applicant's are asked to review the claim language to simplify the wording of the claims and to clarify what is being claimed.
3. The rejection below is written with an understanding of the invention as discussed in the prior interview with applicant and with the aid of the submitted drawing. The differences between the autoCAD references, previously applied as a USC 102 reference, and the current invention are now understood by the examiner. However, applicant's information disclosure statement of 4/1/2004 cited Japanese Publication Number 8314985 A which shows a figure on page -1131- (believed to be figure 9) which appears to be virtually the same (however much more simple) as the drawing submitted by applicant to clarify the claims. Previous rejections with regard to the autoCAD references are written below as USC 103 rejections based upon the autoCAD reference in view of the Japanese publication. Applicant is invited to telephone

Art Unit: 2125

examiner, if desired, with any questions or to schedule an interview to discuss these claims and their relation to the art of record prior to their response to this office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 14-18, 21-25, 28, 43-45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “AutoCAD 2000 – 3D Modeling, a Visual Approach” by John Wilson in view of Japanese Publication Number 08-314985 (JP 8314985 A) to Yutaka.

1. Referring to claim 14, 21, 28-36, Wilson shows an information processing apparatus comprising: display control means for controlling the display of a 3D model and a virtual plane from a view point on a visual line which is different from the normal line of the virtual plane (Figure 6-17), the virtual plane on which attribution information including at least one of dimensions and dimensional tolerance on a 3D model is pasted being set by the attribution allocation plane setting means (Page 461); and changing means for changing direction of the visual line in response to selecting the displayed virtual plane on the virtual 3D space so that the normal line of the displayed virtual plane may coincide with the virtual line (Pages 476 and 477).
2. Wilson does not show displaying a 3D model and the virtual plane in the same virtual 3D space from a view point which is different from the normal line of the virtual plane.

Art Unit: 2125

3. Yutaka shows a method of outputting three-dimensional cad drawings for a part design system. Yutaka specifically shows displaying a 3D model and the virtual plane in the same virtual 3D space from a view point which is different from the normal line of the virtual plane on page -1131- in figure 9. Yutaka also suggests in the abstract "The output processing part generates a 2-dimensional projection drawing in a direction defaulted or specified from three-dimensional shape data".

4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the 3D model and virtual plane display concepts presented in Yutaka to display the a 3D model and the virtual plane in the same virtual 3D space from a view point which is different from the normal line of the virtual plane in a system shown similar to Figure 6-3 of the Wilson reference because this view would allow the user to view the 2D and 3D models in the same scale and better understand the scope of the model.

5. Referring to claims 15, 16, 22, and 23, Wilson shows attribution information allocation means for allocating said attribution information in the normal direction of a virtual plane set by said attribution allocation plane setting means. Examiner notes that this means "using a layer" and assigning attributes to a specific layer. This is well known in as an AutoCAD function.

6. Referring to claims 17 and 24, Wilson shows display method setting means for setting at least one of a display information set, a display magnification, a display center and a display direction (Figure 6.18), storage means for storing, on said virtual plane set by said attribution allocation plane setting means, said display method information set by said display method setting means ("Dimensions in model space" paragraph on the page following page 459).

Art Unit: 2125

7. Referring to claims 18 and 25, Wilson shows holding means for holding, together with said 3D model, said virtual plane set by said attribution allocation plane setting means and said display method information set by said display method setting means. Examiner notes that this means “using a layer” and assigning attributes to a specific layer. This is well known in as an AutoCAD function. Examiner also notes at the language of this claim is confusing and may be misinterpreted.

8. Referring to claims 43-45, Wilson shows attribution allocation plane selecting means for selecting a position of a virtual plane (“viewport”, page 478), the virtual plane being displayed with a 3D model in the same virtual 3D space; and pasting means for pasting attribution information including at least one of dimensions and dimensional tolerance of the 3D model on the virtual plane in response to designating input of attribution information (figure 6-18 and page 461).

9. Claims 19, 20, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “AutoCAD 2000 – 3D Modeling, a Visual Approach” by John Wilson in view of Japanese Publication Number 08-314985 (JP 8314985 A) to Yutaka as shown above and further in view of “AutoCAD 2000: The complete reference” by David Cohn.

10. Referring to claims 19 and 26, Wilson/Yutaka does not specifically show attribution information size setting means for, based on said display magnification for said display method information set by said display method setting means, setting the size of said attribution information base.

Art Unit: 2125

11. Cohn shows attribution information size setting means for, based on said display magnification for said display method information set by said display method setting means, setting the size of said attribution information base (Examiner notes that this is an inherent feature to any graphics program. When you zoom in, the features get bigger.).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to use the basic AutoCAD information as shown in Cohn in the 3D modeling of Wilson because the parts shown in Cohn are simply pieces of the software of Wilson that are of such basic skill level that they are not shown in the reference. Examiners notes that all pieces of the Cohn reference are also found in the Wilson reference because it is the very same software program.

13. Examiner also notes that all claim limitations of claim 19 are moot because the “display magnification” limitation of claim 17 may not be selected.

14. Referring to claim 20 and 27, Cohn shows a display coordinate axis setting means for setting the horizontal or perpendicular direction on a display; and display means for displaying said 3D model or said attribution information based on information set by said display coordinate axis setting means (Figure 19.1).

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Masinick whose telephone number is (571) 272-3746. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7:30-4:00.

Art Unit: 2125

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on (571) 272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Michael D Masinick  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2125

MDM